

Soft CP breaking and the strong-CP problem

L. Lavoura

Universidade Técnica de Lisboa

CFIF, Instituto Superior Técnico, Edifício Ciência (física)

P-1096 Lisboa Codex, Portugal

February 1, 2008

Abstract

I put forward a model with vectorlike isosinglet quarks in which soft breaking of CP leads to strong CP violation only arising at two-loop level.

Non-perturbative effects in Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD) may lead to P and CP violation, characterized by a parameter θ , in strong interactions. The experimental upper bound on the electric dipole moment of the neutron requires $\theta \lesssim 2 \times 10^{-10}$ [1]. (Electric dipole moments of elementary particles are both P- and T-violating; in normal field theory, T violation is equivalent to CP violation.) The presence of this unnaturally small number in QCD is known as the strong-CP problem.

θ is the sum of two terms, θ_{QCD} and θ_{QFD} . θ_{QCD} is the original value of the angle θ characterizing the QCD vacuum. θ_{QFD} originates in the chiral rotation of the quark fields needed to render the quark masses real and positive. If M_p and M_n are the mass matrices of the up-type (charge 2/3) and down-type (charge $-1/3$) quarks, then $\theta_{QFD} = \arg \det(M_p M_n)$.

There are two general ways of solving the strong-CP problem. In the first approach θ is claimed to have no significance or physical consequences; theories with different values of θ are equivalent, and we may set $\theta = 0$ without loss of generality. This may be so because of the presence in the theory of a Peccei–Quinn symmetry [2], but there are also claims that QCD dynamics itself cures the strong-CP problem [3]. The second path, which I shall follow, tries to find some symmetry which naturally leads to the smallness of θ . As θ is the coefficient of a quartic term in the Lagrangian which is both CP- and P-violating, one first assumes the Lagrangian — or at least its quartic part — to be either CP- or P-symmetric, thereby automatically obtaining $\theta_{QCD} = 0$. CP or P symmetry must then be either softly or spontaneously broken. While doing this the problem of ensuring the smallness of θ_{QFD} remains. We must obtain quark mass matrices which, even though they are complex — because after all we know that CP

is violated in the electroweak interactions — are such that $\det(M_p M_n)$ is real. Afterwards, we must still ensure that the quantum (loop) corrections to the mass matrices do not lead to a much too large θ_{QFD} .

In this letter I put forward a model in which the quartic terms of the Lagrangian are assumed to enjoy CP symmetry, thereby setting $\theta_{QCD} = 0$. CP symmetry is softly broken by the mass terms, which have dimension three, of isosinglet vectorlike quarks. The assumption that a symmetry is broken only by terms of cubic dimension is technically natural, in the sense that it is not corrected by infinite renormalizations. Therefore, there will be no non-real divergent renormalization of the quartic terms in the Lagrangian. Because of a particular discrete symmetry, θ_{QFD} vanishes at tree level. I explicitly show that θ_{QFD} also vanishes at one-loop level. My model has some similarity with two previous ones [4, 5], but is simpler and more economic than any of them.

The gauge group is $SU(2) \otimes U(1)$ just as in the standard model (SM). The scalar sector consists of the usual doublet ϕ of the SM (with $\tilde{\phi} \equiv i\tau_2 \phi^*$) together with a real singlet S . The lepton sector is as in the SM. The quark sector consists of the usual three left-handed doublets $q_L = (p_L, n_L)^T$, the three right-handed up-type quarks p_R , and the three right-handed down-type quarks n_R . Besides, I also assume the existence of l $SU(2)$ -singlet vectorlike quarks of charge $-1/3$, with left-handed components N_L and right-handed components N_R . The number l is arbitrary.

The model has a discrete symmetry under which both S and the N_R change sign while all other fields remain unaffected. As a consequence, the scalar potential is

$$V = \mu_1 \phi^\dagger \phi + \lambda_1 (\phi^\dagger \phi)^2 + \mu_2 S^2 + \lambda_2 S^4 + \lambda_3 S^2 \phi^\dagger \phi \quad (1)$$

and the Yukawa Lagrangian is

$$\mathcal{L}_Y = -\overline{\Pi_L} \phi - \overline{\Pi_L} \tilde{\phi} \sqrt{\mathcal{R}} - \overline{\mathcal{N}_L} S \mp \mathcal{N}_R + \mathcal{H}.], \quad (2)$$

where Γ and Δ are 3×3 matrices, Υ is an $l \times l$ matrix. The mass terms $-\overline{N_L} M n_R + H.c.$, where M is an $l \times 3$ matrix, are relevant too. The vacuum expectation value (vev) of ϕ is $ve^{i\alpha}$ and the one of S is V . I decompose the scalar multiplets as

$$\phi = e^{i\alpha} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi^+ \\ v + (H + i\chi)/\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad S = V + R. \quad (3)$$

$\varphi^\pm$ and χ are the charged and neutral Goldstone bosons, to be absorbed as the longitudinal components of the $W^\pm$ and Z gauge bosons, respectively. After using the vacuum-stability conditions to eliminate μ_1 and μ_2 in favor of v and V , the Higgs potential in Eq. (1) yields the mass terms for H and R :

$$V = 2\lambda_1 v^2 H^2 + 4\lambda_2 V^2 R^2 + 2\sqrt{2}\lambda_3 v V H R + \dots \quad (4)$$

It follows that H and R mix to form the two physical scalar particles, which I shall denote S_1 and S_2 . I denote the mixing angle ψ .

At tree level

$$\theta_{QFD} = \arg \det[(e^{i\alpha} v \Gamma)(e^{-i\alpha} v \Delta)(V \Upsilon)] = \arg \det(\Gamma \Delta \Upsilon) \quad (5)$$

does not depend on α .

Let us denote $M_u = \text{diag}(m_u, m_c, m_t)$ the diagonal matrix of the masses of the three up-type quarks, and $M_d = \text{diag}(m_d, m_s, m_b, \dots)$ the diagonal matrix of the masses of the $l + 3$ down-type quarks. Without loss of generality, we may choose to work in the weak basis in which $p_L = u_L$ and $p_R = u_R$ are the physical up-type-quark fields, and $\Delta = M_u/(ve^{-i\alpha})$. In this basis, we must bi-diagonalize the mass matrix of the down-type quarks. This we do by performing the unitary transformations (A may be L or R)

$$\begin{pmatrix} n_A \\ N_A \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} X_A \\ Y_A \end{pmatrix} d_A, \quad (6)$$

in which X_A is a $3 \times (l + 3)$ and Y_A is an $l \times (l + 3)$ matrix. Indeed, X_L is the Cabibbo–Kobayashi–Maskawa (CKM) mixing matrix of the charged gauge interactions. I define the $(l + 3) \times (l + 3)$ hermitian matrices $H_A \equiv X_A^\dagger X_A$. As a consequence of the unitarity of the transformation matrices in Eq. (6), $Y_A^\dagger Y_A = 1 - H_A$, and $H_A^2 = H_A$. The matrix H_L appears in the neutral-current interactions of the down-type quarks [6], which are given by

$$\frac{g}{\cos \theta_W} Z_\mu \bar{d} \gamma^\mu \left(\frac{\sin^2 \theta_W}{3} - \frac{1 - \gamma_5}{4} H_L \right) d. \quad (7)$$

The decays of the Z measured at LEP, together with the observed suppression of neutral flavor-changing interactions and the near unitarity of the CKM matrix, impose strong constraints on the 3×3 part of X_L corresponding to the three known charge $-1/3$ quarks [7]. I shall assume that both M and the vev V are very large — in the case of M because it consists of singlet mass terms, in the case of V because it is the vev of a singlet field, and it does not break the electroweak gauge group. Under that assumption, the 3×3 part of X_L is almost unitary, as required. Moreover, the mixing angle ψ between H and R scales as v/V [see Eq. (4)]. Therefore, in the limit of large V , R is an eigenstate of mass with mass $\sim V$.

The bi-diagonalization condition is

$$\begin{pmatrix} ve^{i\alpha} \Gamma & 0 \\ M & V \Upsilon \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} X_L \\ Y_L \end{pmatrix} M_d \begin{pmatrix} X_R^\dagger & Y_R^\dagger \end{pmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} H_L M_d (1 - H_R) &= 0, \\ H_R M_d^{-1} (1 - H_L) &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The Yukawa interactions of the fields H and R with the down-type quarks are given by

$$\begin{aligned} -e^{i\alpha} \frac{H}{\sqrt{2}} (\overline{n_L} \Gamma n_R + H.c.) &= -\frac{H}{\sqrt{2}v} (\overline{d_L} H_L M_d d_R + H.c.), \\ -R (\overline{N_L} \Upsilon N_R + H.c.) &= -\frac{R}{V} [\overline{d_L} M_d (1 - H_R) d_R + H.c.], \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where I have used Eqs. (9).

Up to this point I have not postulated anything about the nature of CP violation in this model. I now make the further assumption that the quartic part of the Lagrangian conserves CP. Then, θ_{QCD} vanishes, the matrices Δ , Γ and Υ are real, and $\theta_{QFD} = 0$ at tree level. CP cannot be spontaneously broken in this model, because there is no gauge-invariant phase between the vevs of the scalars (the phase α can be gauged away). Therefore, CP must be softly broken by the only non-quartic terms in the Lagrangian which may be complex: the matrix M . As CP-violating amplitudes are $\sim 10^3$ times smaller than CP-conserving ones, one may naturally assume that the complex phases in the matrix elements of M are all $\sim 10^{-3}$.

The first model in which soft breaking of CP was used to suppress strong CP violation was suggested by Georgi [8]. My present model has a clear similarity with the one of Bento, Branco, and Parada (BBP) [5]. Both models are of the Barr–Nelson [9] type. In the model of BBP CP breaking is spontaneous and there is a complex, instead of real, singlet. There are three neutral scalars, and there is CP violation via scalar-pseudoscalar mixing, which leads to strong CP violation arising at one-loop level. In contrast, in my model, just as in the one of Babu and Mohapatra (BM) [4], there are only two neutral scalars, and there is no scalar-pseudoscalar mixing, allowing strong CP violation to arise only at two-loop level, as I shall now show. The proof is analogous to the one valid in the model of BM.

Strong CP violation might arise at one-loop level via the self-energies of the down-type quarks, which give rise to complex mass terms. The relevant diagram is the one in Fig. 1. Let us denote the mass term originating from that diagram Σ_d^{ab} . Σ_d is an $(l+3) \times (l+3)$ complex matrix. The resulting contribution to θ_{QFD} is $\text{Im tr}(M_d^{-1} \Sigma_d)$ [10]. As M_d is diagonal, only the diagonal matrix elements of Σ_d are relevant. Now, from Eqs. (10)

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_d^{ab} &= \sum_{k=1}^{l+3} m_k \left\{ x (H_L M_d)^{ak} (H_L M_d)^{kb} + y [M_d (1 - H_R)]^{ak} [M_d (1 - H_R)]^{kb} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + z (H_L M_d)^{ak} [M_d (1 - H_R)]^{kb} + z [M_d (1 - H_R)]^{ak} (H_L M_d)^{kb} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where the coefficients x , y , and z are real functions, resulting from the loop integration, of the squared mass of the k^{th} down-type quark, m_k^2 , of the masses of S_1 and S_2 , and of the mixing angle ψ . Then, using Eqs. (9), one finds

$$\text{tr}(M_d^{-1} \Sigma_d) = \sum_{k=1}^{l+3} m_k^2 [(x+z) H_L - (y+z) H_R + y]^{kk}. \quad (12)$$

As H_L and H_R are hermitian matrices, their diagonal elements are real, and $\text{Im tr}(M_d^{-1}\Sigma_d)$ vanishes.

θ_{QFD} therefore arises only at two-loop level. Its magnitude should be suppressed by at least two factors: a factor $(16\pi^2)^{-2}$ from the loop integrations, and a factor $\sim 10^{-3}$ from the small CP-violating phases in M . Other suppression factors of the form m_q/m_W , in which m_q is the mass of either the charm or the strange quark, may be present too [10]. It should however be noted that in this model, such as in the one of BBP, due to the non-diagonal character of H_L , there are diagrams contributing to θ_{QFD} at two-loop level with one Z loop and one $W^\pm$ loop, or with two Z loops. Those diagrams evade the suppressions derived, in the context of the SM, in Ref. [10]. They should however be suppressed by the smallness of the non-diagonal matrix elements of H_L . Also, there are diagrams with scalar loops contributing to θ_{QFD} at two-loop level, involving in particular the mixing matrix H_R [see Eq. (10)]. Those diagrams will be suppressed if R is very heavy (if V is very large), as I advocate. Summing up, it is not clear how large may the two-loop contribution to θ_{QFD} be in this model. It is evident anyway that, by avoiding scalar-pseudoscalar mixing, my model avoids an important source of strong CP violation present in the model of BBP, and in many other models.

I thank Lincoln Wolfenstein for having read a draft of the manuscript and commented on it.

References

- [1] V. Baluni, Phys. Rev. D **19**, 2227 (1979); R. Crewther, P. di Vecchia, G. Veneziano, and E. Witten, Phys. Lett. **88B**, 123 (1979).
- [2] R. Peccei and H. Quinn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **38**, 1440 (1977); Phys. Rev. D **16**, 1791 (1977).
- [3] P. Bicudo and J. Ribeiro, Instituto Superior Técnico Report No. FISIST/2-96/CFIF (hep-ph/9604219), 1996 (to be published).
- [4] K. S. Babu and R. N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. D **15**, 1958 (1990).
- [5] L. Bento, G. C. Branco, and P. Parada, Phys. Lett. B **267**, 95 (1991).
- [6] G. C. Branco and L. Lavoura, Nucl. Phys. **B278**, 738 (1986).
- [7] L. Lavoura and J. P. Silva, Phys. Rev. D **47**, 1117 (1993).
- [8] H. Georgi, Hadr. J. **1**, 155 (1981).
- [9] A. Nelson, Phys. Lett. **136B**, 387 (1984); Phys. Lett. **143B**, 165 (1984); S. M. Barr, Phys. Rev. Lett. **53**, 329 (1984);
- [10] J. Ellis and M. K. Gaillard, Nucl. Phys. **B150**, 141 (1979).

This figure "fig1-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9611268v1>